

Sl



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,163	11/07/2000	Ji Zhang	CISCP194/3541	1039

22434 7590 06/22/2004
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

PHILIPPE, GIMS S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/708,163

Applicant(s)

ZHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Gims S Philippe

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2613

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment received on April 9th 2004 has been fully considered and entered, but the arguments are moot in view of the new ground (s) of rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGraw, Sr. et al. (US Patent no. 5,577,042) in view of Grant et al. (US Patent no. 6,553,566).

Regarding claims 1, 18, 23, 30 and 31, McGraw discloses a method and network device for providing first compressed video data unto a network (See Abstract and Fig. 1); comprising an embedder apparatus having a first embedder portion in a transmission bitstream (See McGraw col. 2, lines 57-67, col. 3, lines 1-20); and a transmitter that transmits the transmission bitstream, the transmission bitstream including first compressed video data having the first compressed format (See col. 3, lines 25-41).

It is noted that McGraw is silent about embedding first compressed video data having a first compressed format in a transmission bitstream having a second compressed format as specified in the claims.

Grant et al. discloses embedding first compressed video data having a first compressed format in a transmission bitstream having a second compressed format (See Grant col. 4, lines 1-43).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of embedding first compressed video data having a first compressed format in a transmission bitstream having a second compressed format. The skilled artisan would be motivated to look to Grant to incorporate its teachings in McGraw's network device. The motivation for performing such a modification in McGraw is to enable the viewer of television programming to exercise individual control over the portions of broadcast content, which are deemed to be objectionable as taught by Grant et al. (See Grant col. 1, lines 47-60).

As per claims 2, 5, 7-10, 20, 22, 24, 25, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejections of claims 1, 18, 23, 30 and 31. In addition, because McGraw discloses directing inputs of different signal formats to at least one application subsystem by directing the input signal to different output ports according to the information embedded in the signal in real time, it is considered inherent that providing a plurality of format converter is a must (See McGraw col. 3, lines 16-23, col. 22, lines 40-65, col. 26, lines 64-67, and col. 42, lines 48-67).

As per claims 14 and 19, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejections of claims 1 and 18. In addition, McGraw further provides the claimed network interface in col. 44, lines 46-49.

As per claim 15, the broadcast and presentation system of fig. 1, item 10 is the claimed "headend" (See McGraw col. 4, lines 43-46).

As per claims 16-17 and 26, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 14. In addition, McGraw device further provides a memory for storing the bitstream and a general-purpose computer (See McGraw col. 24, lines 27-55).

As per claim 13, the bit rate converter is suggested in McGraw col. 5, lines 3-6.

As per claims 3-4, 27, 28, a second compressed bitstream in a second format is suggested in McGraw col. 9, lines 43-67.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGraw, Sr. et al. (US Patent no. 5,577,042) and Grant et al. (US Patent no. 6,553,566) as applied to claim 5, and further in view of Lankford (US Patent no. 5,467,139).

Art Unit: 2613

As per claim 6, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 5.

It is noted that McGraw is silent about a scheduler comprised in the embedder as specified in claim 6.

However, Lankford discloses a device and network for providing compressed video data including the step of providing a scheduler comprised in the embedder (See Lankford col. 2, lines 41-50).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying McGraw's embedder by incorporating Lankford's scheduler in the device and network for providing compressed video data. The motivation for performing such a modification in McGraw is to operate the system according to a predetermined schedule as taught by Lankford (See Lankford col.2, lines 45-47).

5. Claims 11-12, 21, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGraw Sr. et al. (US Patent no. 5,577,042) and Grant et al. (US Patent no. 6,553,566) as applied to claims 1, 19 and 28 above, and further in view of Wee et al. (US Patent no. 6,507,618).

As per claims 11-12, 21, 29, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claims 1, 19 and 28.

Art Unit: 2613

It is noted that McGraw is silent about providing compressed video data wherein the format is either one of wavelet, fractal, H.26X, Real Network, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4 as specified.

However, Wee discloses a device and network for providing compressed video data including the step of providing compressed video data wherein the format is either one of wavelet, fractal, H.26X, Real Network, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4 (See Wee col. 7, lines 27).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying McGraw embedder by incorporating compressed video data wherein the format is either one of wavelet, fractal, H.26X, Real Network, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4. The motivation for performing such a modification in McGraw is to be able to support a wide variety of systems, including video recording, video editing, cable and satellite service providers as taught by Wee (See Wee col. 7, lines 21-31).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gims S Philippe whose telephone number is (703) 305-1107. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-7:00) Second Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris S Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2613

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Gims S Philippe
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2613

GSP

June 21, 2004